

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were pending in the application. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended herein, claims 3, 16-17 and 22-23 have been canceled herein, and claims 28-32 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-2, 4-15, 18-21 and 24-32 are now pending.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to disclose the mechanism for a statistic generator circuit. The claim has been amended to now recite a "statistics generator routine running on a general purpose computer."

Applicants wish to thank Examiner for the courtesy of a brief telephone interview on March 2, 2004. During the telephone interview Examiner opined that the use of "templates," such as HTML code to define a Web page, is well known in the art. Examiner asserted that the term "template" is broad enough to encompass the code for generating the form and layout of a Web page. As Applicants understand Examiner's assertion, Examiner seems to be saying that the Figure 7 of Jain teaches a "template" (i.e., the placement and content of the display) wherein recorded events may be included (i.e., the various different video feeds 402, 405).

Without acceding to Examiner's interpretation of Jain but accepting it solely for the sake of argument, Applicants respectfully submit that Jain nonetheless fails to teach a template that is a pre-written description of a generic event as required by amended claim 1. At best, the pre-written "template" of Jain would describe things such as "place a display window 402 in the upper left hand corner," "place a second display window 406 in the upper right hand corner," "place control buttons 414 below display window 402," and the like. This is not a description of a generic event, it is a description of a display format.

In other words, Jain concerns itself with the display of content, whereas claim 1 concerns itself with the content itself. Jain teaches a pre-written description of a display, which happens to display a football game in the illustrated embodiment. If the event were changed to a hockey game, the "template" of Jain would not change; it would be the same description of the placement of the various windows on the display. If the event were changed to a track meet, the "template" of Jain would not change; it would be the same description of the placement of the

various windows on the display. If the event were changed to a political debate, the “template” of Jain would not change; it would be the same description of the placement of the various windows on the display. This is because the “template” of Jain, to use Examiner’s lexicon, does not describe a generic event (such as a football game or a political event); instead it describes the form and layout of a display.

By contrast, claim 1 requires a template that is a pre-written description of the actual event. While it is possible that some templates might be generic enough to cover more than one type of sport, it is contemplated that generally a pre-written description of a generic football game would be used to generate an article about a football game, a pre-written description of a generic hockey game would be employed if the system was used to generate an article about a hockey game, a pre-written description of a political debate would be used to generate an article about a political debate, and the like. Jain simply provides no such teaching of a pre-written description of a generic event.

Claim 1 also requires “comparing the at least one condition to the statistics and . . . identifying as candidate article templates those article templates for which the at least one condition is met by the statistics.” Examiner’s assertion on this point suggests Examiner does not appreciate the difference between a “recorded event” and an “article template.” Note that the claim requires selecting an article template. By contrast, Examiner argues that Jain teaches “the data filtering function of the capture/filter process is a selector routine which help end user to strip-away multi-media data that is relatively unimportant to the end user.” Note, however, that this is a description of filtering out events, not templates. In fact, in an earlier paragraph, Examiner used similar language to assert that Jain teaches recorded events, to wit: “a database comprised of logs which corresponding to a specific happening and a plurality of events, can be filters out and produce a new database based on user-defined selection criteria, statistical information, etc.” Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner maintain a consistent interpretation of Jain – either Jain teaches a capture/filter process that selects events or Jain teaches a capture/filter process that selects templates. It cannot be both.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Claims 2 and 4-8, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the reasons provided with regard to claim 1 as well as for their further defining limitations.

Independent claim 9 requires "comparing the game statistics to a plurality of conditions associated with a plurality of templates." One example of such a "condition" is whether a score differential has been exceeded. One example of such a "template" is a narrative description of a generic game. One example of "comparing" would be to determine if the score differential has been exceeded, and if so, selecting a particular template. While Applicants do not believe the above examples limit the scope of the claims, Applicants feel it is important to provide a precise context for the claim language. Applicants respectfully and earnestly request Examiner to provide an equally concise explanation of how a "template" is "selected" based upon a "condition" in Jain. Applicants have carefully reviewed Examiner's rejection and the cited portions of the reference and frankly find no correlation between the two. Even accepting (solely for the sake of argument) Examiner's assertion that the viewing windows of Jain are "templates," Applicants nonetheless find no teaching or suggestion that one such "template" is selected based upon a conditional requirement. If Examiner would provide even one such example from the Jain reference, Applicants might be in a position to better respond to the rejection. As the record now stands, Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner has failed to clearly show how every element of claim 9 and its dependent claims 10 through 15 are taught or suggested by Jain. As such, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Claim 18 requires a process that "applies a weighting evaluation to each template having conditions met by the statistics and outputs a single selected template." Examiner has merely asserted that claims 18-19 and 21-25 recite similar features as earlier claims and hence "were rejected for the same reasons." Applicants strongly disagree. In fact, Examiner has nowhere addressed the "weighting evaluation" of claim 18 with regard to another claim. Examiner has failed to meet the burden of showing any teaching or suggestion in Jain of the above recited claim element. In fact, Jain provides no teaching or suggestion. As such, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 and claims 19-21 and 24-25 that depend therefrom.

Claims 26 and 27 were added in Applicants' immediately prior response. Claim 26 expressly recites "each article template being a text-based description of a generic event." Claim 27 expressly recites that "each article template being a text-based description of a generic event." Surprisingly, Examiner has not even acknowledged these newly added and significant claim limitations. By Examiner's own admission, Jain teaches a "graphical representation (or interface) of content-based, event-driven templates" (see paragraph 10 of the Office Action). Jain does not teach a text-based description of a generic event, as required by claims 26 and 27. As such, the rejection of claims 26 and 27 should be withdrawn.

Newly added claim 28 recites "providing a plurality of article templates, each such article template being a text-based, narrative description of a generic game of said sport. Examiner has nowhere identified, and Applicants are unaware of any teaching or suggestion in Jain to provide a text-based, narrative description of a game. Claim 28 further recites "generating pre-selected statistics from the recorded events, said pre-selected statistics including a final score differential." Examiner has nowhere identified, and Applicants are unaware of any teaching or suggestion in Jain to provide a final score differential. For these reasons, as well as for the further defining limitations of claim 28, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 is allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 29 through 32 are allowable for the reasons given with respect to claim 28, from which they depend, as well as for their further defining limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4-15, 18-21 and 24-32 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that Examiner pass the case to issuance.

March 3, 2004
Date

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd.
Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel. 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

Respectfully submitted,

Steven H. Slater
Steven H. Slater
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,361